

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 are rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the remarks contained herein.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nonomura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,734,788). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As reflected by the proposed amendments, claims 1-15 have been amended to emphasize the title management information file in its role within the disclosed data structure. In particular, as reflected in Figs. 2 and 5, the title management information files each contain a title segment that includes a playlist pointer, as well as other constituent elements, that specifically reference one or more playitems. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to show the arrangement of constituent elements to define the claimed data structure as presented in the amended claims. It is the Examiner's position that the title information is shown in Nonomura in Figs. 3B and 4 as the title management information table (referencing column 6, line 28 through column 7, line 6). The file structure shown in Figure 3A of the reference is different from that compared with the vts file shown in Fig. 5 and recited in the amended claims.

First, the vts file is recorded in a directory that is separate from the playlist file. As shown in Fig. 5, the vts file has a separate element, "Table of Title Segments" that are directed to individual title segments that, in turn, are directed to various playlists having individual playitems. This file structure is not shown in the cited reference.

Second, the vts file shown in the present application, as recited in the amended claims has separate title segments. These title segments have indicators directed to various pointers that are, in turn, directed to individual items in the selected playlist.

The Examiner also asserts that the reference teaches that title management information includes one segment associated with at least one playlist directory referring specifically to Fig. 3B, column 6, lines 48-66. However, this section on the reference also does not teach using the same combination of constituent elements necessary to execute the random/shuffle reproduction mode as taught and recited in the present application. There is no teaching or data structure corresponding to the title management information file as recited in the amended claims.

In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection as it may apply to the now amended claims.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-15 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Terry L. Clark at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By 
Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

TLC/dab